

April 30, 2021

Mr. Dan Osoba
City of Aurora – Planning Department
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, Suite 2300
Aurora, Colorado 80012

RE: Citadel on Colfax Self-Storage – Site Plan with Conditional Use
Application Number: DA-1422-14
Case Numbers: 2020-6017-05; 2017-6017-06
2nd Planning Submittal Comments Response

Dear Mr. Osoba,

Please find below our responses to the 2nd planning review comments to the Site Plan for the proposed Citadel on Colfax Self-Storage. To facilitate your review, we have included the original comments (key issues and numbered comments) in italicized font and have provided our responses in bold.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

1A. No questions, comments, or concerns were received from adjacent property owners during this review.

Response: Noted.

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

2A. Continue working with the Citadel Master DRC to finalize their comments and requested building elevation modifications. Include the subsequent review from the DRC with your next submission.

Response: Review letter from the DRC included in this submission.

2B. Justification and mitigation for each adjustment request must be included on the cover sheet and letter of introduction. Please see the full list of required adjustments below:

- *Western Landscape Buffer*
- *Northern Landscape Buffer*
- *Southern Landscape Buffer*
- *Transparency Requirement (50%)*

Response: The adjustments for the buffers are no longer needed. All buffers meet the reduction requirements with the use of a fence or low wall. Information regarding the adjustment to the transparency requirement has been added to the cover sheet and letter of introduction.

2C. Advisory Note: If the LOMR is approved during the City review, please remove or revise note 3 to reflect it.

Response: We will revise if the status changes but as of now, the LOMR has not been reviewed by FEMA yet.



3. Zoning and Land Use Comments

3A. *The full list of adjustments required on the cover sheet and letter of introduction. This needs to be included in the next submission to be fully reviewed. There are several adjustment requests that the Planning Department is not supportive of at this time. Please see the list below:*

- *Landscape Buffer Width (Western Buffer)*
- *Landscape Buffer Width (Southern Buffer)*
- *Landscape Buffer Width (Northern Buffer)*

Response: The adjustments for the buffers are no longer needed. All buffers meet the reduction requirements with the use of a fence or low wall. Information regarding the adjustment to the transparency requirement has been added to the cover sheet and letter of introduction.

4. Streets and Pedestrian Issues

4A. *The pedestrian crossing at the southeast corner of the site must be differentiated with a change in color or material per the Master Plan. This should match the other crosswalks adjacent to the development.*

Response: Per the Master Plan, this crosswalk does not need to be stamped concrete. Only the areas adjacent to Altura. This crosswalk is acceptable with the Master Plan and follows the patter of what the surrounding lots have proposed.

4B. *Show and label the crosswalk from Lot1, Block 5 Citadel on Colfax crossing E 14th Ave. Include who is responsible for it.*

Response: There is not crosswalk here. The items indicated are inlets.

5. Fencing and Gating Issues

5A. *Correct the contradicting notes regarding fence height in the details.*

Response: Height has been updated on the details.

6. Architecture and Urban Design Issues

6A. *The height difference between parapets is required at a 3' minimum. Please revise the height difference.*

Response: Height Difference has been revised to meet the 3' minimum.

6B. *EIFS is a permitted material in the Master Site Plan but is no longer a permitted material in the UDO. If a conflicting standard occurs between any approved Master Plan and a UDO standard, the more restrictive standard shall apply. The UDO building materials requirement will apply in this case. Please replace the EIFS materials shown on the elevations with a permitted material per the UDO.*

Response: All EIFS material shown on the elevations has been revised to be 3-Coat Stucco to comply with the UDO building materials requirement.

6C. *The transparency requirement (50% of the ground floor façade) applies but will have to be listed as an adjustment. Please include this on the cover sheet and letter of introduction with your justification and mitigation. This is an adjustment the Planning Department is supporting.*

Response: Noted, cover sheet and letter of introduction has been revised.

6D. *The change in elevation between parapet height on the west elevation is required at a 3' minimum. Please revise the height difference.*

Response: Height Difference has been revised to meet the 3' minimum at the parapets.

7. Signage Issues

7A. *Advisory Note: monument signage is not a separate calculation and is included in the total calculation for signage for the site. The property has 305 s.f. of signage based on the linear frontage and if a double sided 100 s.f. monument sign is proposed, only 105 s.f. of signage will remain for wall signage.*

Response: Noted. This will be accounted for with the sign permit.

8. Landscaping Issues (Kelly Bish / 303-739-7189 / kbish@auroragov.org / Comments in bright teal)

8A. *A reduction in the buffer width is permitted to 5-feet with the installation of a fence, but the area highlighted at the northeast portion of the site is less than the minimum and requires an adjustment request. If requested, include the code section, justification, and any mitigation on the cover sheet of this Site Plan and on the Letter of Introduction.*

Response: Noted.

8B. *Darken the fence line type as it is not visible.*

Response: The Fence has been darkened as requested.

8C. *The northern building perimeter landscaping as identified in the table is not accounting for the areas shown on the plan redlines.*

Response: The northern building perimeter planting is taking these areas into account with the 75 LF measurement, which requires 2 trees (1 tree/40 LF). 1 tree and 10 shrubs have been provided just north of that area to satisfy this requirement.

8D. *Darken the outline of the building.*

Response: Building outline has been adjusted as requested.

8E. *The buffer requirement is not being met for the western buffer along N Altura Blvd. An adjustment is required. Adjustments are based upon a hardship and this is a greenfield site.*

The fact that the applicant is suggesting site constraints limit the provision of the required buffer is not valid. The building can be reduced in size to accommodate the city requirements. Refer to the Landscape section of the UDO for what constitutes an adjustment.

Response: Western Buffer is being met based on proposed planting and Urban Street Frontage requirement. This is being met with proposed planting on-site as well as proposed planting within the R.O.W. outside property boundary.

8F. The 10-foot buffer width on the southern buffer along E 14th Ave is acceptable if a low wall is provided. Otherwise, this is not compliant with the UDO and will require an additional adjustment request, justification and mitigation.

Response: Architecture has been adjusted to include the low wall as requested.

8G. The standard buffer width/buffer width provided section of the landscape non-street buffer table need to list the width required (10') and width provided (X').

Response: Buffer information included as requested.

8H. The western perimeter buffer is not compliant. See the previous item above regarding the western buffer width.

Response: Western Perimeter Buffer has been updated to meet requirements.

8I. Please make the corrections to the Building Perimeter Landscape Requirements table per the redlined comments.

Response: Corrections have been made as requested.

8J. Neither buffer is being met in the Landscape Street Buffer table.

Response: Street buffer is not required due to Urban Street Frontage requirement.

8K. The standard buffer width/buffer width provided section of the Landscape Street Buffer Table need to list the width required (20') and width provided (X').

Response: Buffer information included as requested.

8L. The notes on this page should all be the font size of the utility notes.

Response: Font size has been adjusted as requested.

9. Addressing (Phil Turner / 303-739-7357 / pturner@auroragov.org)

9A. Please provide a digital .shp or .dwg file for addressing and other GIS mapping purposes. Include the parcel, street line, easement and building footprint layers at a minimum. Please ensure that the digital file provided in a NAD 83 feet, Stateplane, Central Colorado projection so it will display correctly within our GIS system. Please eliminate any line work outside of the target area. Please contact me if you need additional information about this digital file.

Response: A DWG file has been sent directly to Phil.

Referral Comments From Other Departments and Agencies

10. Civil Engineering (Kristen Tanabe / 303-739-7306 / KTanabe@auroragov.org / Comments in green)

10A. *The site plan will not be approved by public works until the preliminary drainage letter/report is approved.*

Response: The preliminary drainage report has been approved.

10B. *Fix the leader to point to the portion of the storm sewer to be removed. It may help to add a note to describe the storm to be removed since it is so short.*

Response: Leaders have been corrected to point at the correct items. Additional detail has been added to the note regarding the section of pipe to be removed.

10C. *Label the slope in the landscape area.*

Response: Slope labels added.

10D. *The minimum slope for non-paved areas is 2-percent.*

Response: Slope revised to meet the 2-percent requirement.

11. Traffic Engineering (Brianna Medema / 303-739-7336 / bmedema@auroragov.org / Comments in amber)

11A. *A revised traffic letter was not provided with this submittal. The response letter indicates that the traffic letter has been revised per the 1st round of comments. Please submit the revised traffic letter with the next submission.*

Response: The revised traffic letter has been included with this submittal and addresses the first round of comments.

11B. *Revise the symbols shown on the redlines. Through movement is not possible at the egress locations shown.*

Response: Symbols have been revised to show the correct turning movements.

11C. *The callout shown on the redlines appears to be incorrect.*

Response: Callout corrected.

11D. *Move the corner of the sight triangle to the signed stop location. The sight triangle shown on sheet 2 is correct.*

Response: Sight triangle updated to match Sheet 2.

11E. *Remove PHOP, PIMU, HESE, CAAC, and BETH from sight triangles. These plants exceed the maximum allowable height of 26-inches within sight triangles.*

Response: Plants have been removed and replaced with plants that meet height requirements.

12. Fire/Life Safety (Mark Apodaca / 303-739-7656 / mapodaca@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)

12A. *The light poles shown on the redlines appear to encroach into the fire lane easement. Please move the light poles out of the fire lane easement.*

Response: Light pole blocks have been scaled to the correct size to show they do not encroach into the fire lane easement.

12B. *The stamped concrete section needs to reflect a note stating that it will support the imposed loads of the fire apparatus up to 85,000-lbs. This note must also be shown on the Civil Plans.*

Response: Note has been added to the detail added on the Site Details sheet.

12C. *Provide a detail of the stamped concrete. This will help verify that this surface will not be too rough/bumpy. (2009 ICC A117.1).*

Response: A detail has been added to the Site Details sheet.

12D. *Provide a note stating swing gates shall swing into the site.*

Response: Added to the schedule note.

12E. *Correct schedule note 32 as shown on the redlines.*

Response: Entire width is 26' so it is (2) 13' gates. Note revised accordingly.

13. Aurora Water (Nina Khanzadeh / 303-739-7646 / nkhanzad@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

13A. *The previous page is showing the existing 18" RCP is to be removed. If that is correct, please show it on this sheet.*

Response: Labels on the previous sheet were incorrect. The 18" RCP is a new proposed pipe as shown on this sheet.

13B. *I would recommend relocating street lights outside of existing and proposed utility and fire lane easements. If they cannot be relocated a license agreement will be required. Typical for all street lights.*

- *Note from the Planning Case Manager: please see comment 12A in the Fire/Life Safety section. Light poles shall not be located within a fire lane easement.*

Response: Light poles will be located outside of all fire lane easements but will still fall within existing utility easements so a license agreement will be obtained.

13C. *The water meter is to be located in a landscaped area and a pocket utility easement as listed in section 5 of Aurora Water Specifications.*

Response: Water meter is located in landscape area and in an existing utility easement (Altura Blvd. is an access and utility easement in its entirety) so no pocket utility easement is required.

13D. *List all sanitary sewer lines. Downstream of the connection is private.*

Response: Schedule note revised to label sanitary service as private.

13E. *Manholes are not permitted to be located in cross pans. Please relocate.*

Response: Manhole was not located in the cross pan but has been moved outside of the crosswalk.

13F. *List the water line as shown in the redlines as private, downstream of the water meter.*

Response: Added to schedule note.

13G. *All private fire suppression lines and private water service lines will require backflow preventers.*

Response: Backflow preventors will be located interior to the building. Note has been added to this sheet.

13H. *Call out the location of the water meter and pocket utility easement.*

Response: There is no pocket utility easement for this site. Water meter and existing utility Easement have been called out on plans.

14. PROS (Curtis Bish / 303-739-7131 / cbish@auroragov.org / Comments in mauve)

14A. *Where the property line overlaps the trail, including the 2' recovery zone, an easement is needed for public access. Work with Real Property Services to dedicate this easement.*

• *Note: there are two locations where this occurs, which will required two separate easement dedications.*

Response: An access easement has been added as requested. We will work with Real Property to get the easement dedicated.

15. Real Property (Maurice Brooks / 303-739-7294 / mbrooks@auroragov.org / Comments in magenta)

15A. *Advisory Note: There are some easement issues and some License Agreement issues. See the comments on the document. Contact Andy Niquette (aniquett@auroragov.org) for the easement concerns and Contact Grace Gray (ggray@auroragov.org) for the License Agreement concerns. Please note that the site plan cannot be approved until all the items needed are submitted, fully reviewed and ready to record.*

Response: We will work through the easement and license agreements with Grace and Andy.

15B. *Add the monument sign to the license agreement for the encroachment into the easement.*

• *Note from the Planning Case Manager: per comment 14A, public access easements are required where the trail overlaps the property line. Any encroachment into that easement may be required to be included in the license agreement. Please verify with Grace Gray (ggray@auroragov.org) and include as necessary.*

Response: Monument sign will be included in the license agreement.

15C. Add the stamped concrete to the license agreement for the encroachment into the easement.

Response: Stamped concrete will be included in the license agreement.

15D. Contact Andy Niquette for the dedication of the fire lane easement and other easements as required by the comments in this letter.

Response: We will work with Andy to get all easements dedicated.

15E. Add the swinging gates to the license agreement for the encroachment into the easement.

Response: Gates will be included in the license agreement.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to review this application. We look forward to working with you towards approval of this development proposal.

Sincerely,
GALLOWAY

Scott Brown
Civil Engineering Project Manager
ScottBrown@GallowayUS.com